

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**



**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2006
KIVA – CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:13 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Mark Gilliland
Vice-Chairman Brian Davis
Commissioner J. David Hill
Commissioner William Howard
Commissioner Kelly McCall

ABSENT: Commissioner Michael Bruz
Commissioner Matthew Taunton

STAFF PRESENT: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Debra Astin, Transit Manager
John Little, Downtown Executive Director
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

OTHERS: Matt Burdick, ADOT
Fred Garcia, ADOT

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

VICE-CHAIRMAN DAVIS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR THE STUDY SESSION AND THE REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 19, 2006. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HILL, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).

2. **DOWNTOWN TROLLEY ROUTE**

Ms. Debra Astin, Transit Manager, addressed the Commission. Highlights of her presentation included maps of the current and proposed trolley route. She informed the Commission that because of ongoing construction and technical issues with the bollards on the bridge, trolley

route changes will not take place until Fall 2006. Ms. Astin stated that ample notification would be provided to area businesses prior to implementing any route changes.

Ms. Astin discussed the Canal Bank Master Plan adopted in 2002. She explained the reasons for the proposed trolley route change and reviewed the changes.

Ms. Astin reported businesses on Craftsman's Court have circulated a petition to have the trolley route remain on that street. Although there is no legal requirement to do so, staff agendized the downtown trolley route modification proposal in order to provide a forum for affected businesses to make their opinions known. She noted that copies of the (faxed) petition, in addition to summaries of telephone calls received by Transportation staff, are contained in the Commissioner packets.

Ms. Astin clarified that staff is seeking a Commission recommendation regarding the proposed trolley route changes. However, as mentioned, since no route changes can take place until Fall 2006, the decision need not be made at tonight's meeting.

Chairman Gilliland called for public comment.

Judy Kablen, representing Hotel Valley Ho, 6850 E. Main St., Scottsdale, 85251, addressed the Commission. She expressed that the Hotel Valley Ho would be in favor of the trolley route change, noting the conveniences that would be added for their clients as well as local residents. She suggested extending the operating hours.

JoAnn Handley, 6813 E. Monterey Way, Scottsdale, 85251, addressed the Commission. She expressed support for the new trolley route with a modification to include Craftsman Court.

Allen Pile, shop owner, 7121 5th Avenue, Scottsdale, 85251, addressed the Commission, expressing support for continuing service on Craftsman Court. He opined people would be served better because of the wide variety of shops, restaurants, and parking facilities available along Craftsman Court as opposed to the limited amount of parking on Marshall Way.

Mackey Martin, representing Re-Max Discover, 4234 N. Craftsman Court, Studio 2, Scottsdale, 85251 addressed the Commission. She suggested alternating the route between Craftsman Court and Marshall Way and including Main Street because it is significant to what is happening in the downtown area.

Rachelle Harris, submitted a comment but wished not to speak. Chairman Gilliland read Ms. Harris' comments expressing support for keeping the trolley route on Craftsman Court. Ms. Harris also expressed a concern about the lack of pedestrian traffic in the area.

Ms. Astin responded to a comment by Mr. Pile regarding a stop on Third Avenue. She explained there has been a problem on the south corner by the Bada Boom Pasta Room, noting that if the route is changed, the stop will be moved to the north side of the street. She mentioned that Transportation staff generally place stops approximately every 500 feet, but also review the specific issues at each location.

Ms. Astin responded to the comment by Ms. Martin regarding alternating the route between Craftsman Court and Marshall Way. She noted making that change would leave those two streets with a 20 minute wait as opposed to a ten minute wait on the rest of the route, which would be confusing to riders. She reiterated that it would take away from the simplicity of the route, because there is not a set schedule.

In response to an inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Ms. Astin clarified that the loop denoted in the northeast corner of the route map will be bi-directional.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner McCall, Ms. Astin showed on the route map which areas of Fifth Avenue would be served for each route choice. She noted that the Marshall Way route would allow more of Fifth Avenue to be served.

Commissioner Hill commended the people from downtown and the business owners from Craftsman Court for voicing their opinions. He has not seen any compelling evidence for moving the route and opined that including Craftsman Court as part of the final trolley route would provide better coverage.

Ms. O'Connor reported that another speaker had arrived, bringing with her faxes and letters. These are normally not accepted at meetings, as staff includes that information in the Commissioner packets. Ms. O'Connor suggested that staff do more outreach at a more convenient time for downtown business owners. She stated that she and John Little agreed to put together a forum for input from downtown businesses and that they would come back to the Commission with a summarized version of public comment.

In response to a question by Chairman Gilliland, Ms. Astin explained the reason for moving the route was to serve Marshall Way because it is considered a major pedestrian corridor in downtown plans, and this would help balance coverage.

John Little explained that the shaded areas on the trolley map depict a unified Scottsdale Downtown Arts District. He noted this designation is for marketing and way-finding purposes and will change as the downtown area changes.

Wendy Cashaback, shop owner on Craftsman Court, expressed opposition to the proposed trolley route change. She mentioned that she spearheaded the petition effort and noted that businesses on Craftsman Court would struggle without the business brought in by the trolley.

Chairman Gilliland noted that two letters submitted in opposition to the proposed trolley route would be attached to the minutes.

Commissioner Hill opined that even though action is not being taken, the Commission should be responsive to the group of business owners and make every attempt to compensate them with a transit amenity that they want. He noted that the current route gives better coverage for both Craftsman Court and Marshall Way than the proposed route.

Vice-Chairman Davis inquired about public parking availability at the Valley Ho, opining that it appears accommodations are being made to benefit one business. Ms. O'Connor noted there is a residential development adjacent to the Valley Ho. Vice-Chairman Davis suggested parking availability at Fashion Square would be more convenient for people interested in going downtown.

Ms. O'Connor explained the changing philosophy is for the trolley to become not only a tourist amenity, but also a residential amenity. The goal is to provide not just access to visitors and parking opportunities, but opportunities for circulation among downtown area residents.

Ms. Astin clarified the reason the trolley enters the Valley Ho is for a turn around. She noted that Main Street no longer goes through to 68th Street, because that portion was abandoned and became part of the Valley Ho.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairman Davis, Ms. Astin noted she would need to research the cost to the City of changing signs and publicity.

Ms. Astin explained the system used in deciding how to balance the coverage of the trolley route, noting requests for service from businesses on First Avenue would be reviewed. She explained that the 500-foot distance between stops was identified by a downtown committee in 1998, and may be reevaluated.

Ms. O'Connor recommended that before decisions are made, additional information should be collected to be included in the Commission packets. She suggested providing an updated map of downtown, analyzing the 500-foot distance, and allowing Mr. Little to summarize the evolution of Downtown Scottsdale.

Ms. Astin stated that parking was not taken into consideration when designing the trolley route. She clarified trolleys would pass a stop every ten minutes, potentially every five minutes for bi-directional streets.

Commissioner Howard opined that Craftsman Court is historically significant in Scottsdale. It was the original arts district and that legacy should be preserved. He suggested that the data presented offers a compelling argument; however does not make clear that the new route would offer an improvement. He noted he would walk the area himself in order to make an informed recommendation.

COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO TABLE THE DISCUSSION OF THE TROLLEY ROUTE UNTIL AN APPROPRIATE FUTURE MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HILL.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner McCall, Ms. Astin clarified that the resort trolley service is a separate service paid for by the resorts. The service runs north on Scottsdale Road to the Hyatt at Gainey Ranch, and through Paradise Valley to the Phoenician, Camelback Inn, and the Sanctuary. She noted there are 11 resorts using the service.

Ms. Astin confirmed that in addition to parking at Fashion Square, there is public parking between Fifth Street and Third Street, and Craftsman Court and Scottsdale Road. She noted an updated map of parking facilities would be provided in a future Commission packet.

Mr. Little addressed the Commission. He summarized the parking availability and the variety of types of businesses coming into the area. He opined that downtown Scottsdale is a very dynamic area and the trolley routes will need to be strategically adjusted as the City grows. In response to an inquiry by Commissioner McCall, Ms. O'Connor confirmed that the Transportation Department is working to keep the lines of communication open. She clarified that the petition and e-mail sent by Ms. Cashaback were received by the Transportation Department by fax, which is unusual.

In response to a question from Chairman Gilliland, Ms. Astin reported that the signs installed at the various stops include a downtown map. She noted that the Downtown Group is installing benches throughout the downtown area.

In response to an inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Ms. Astin explained the configuration of Goldwater makes it difficult to provide stops. She mentioned continuing the trolley route connection with Loloma Station on the southern end in order to provide service for downtown employees.

Chairman Gilliland noted his support for the motion to table the discussion. He requested that the Commission be supplied with information on operational constraints and a summary of the logic behind the proposed changes. Ms. O'Connor suggested that, in order to provide clarity to downtown businesses in attendance, that this item would be tentatively reconsidered for action at the May 2006 Commission meeting.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).

MS. O'CONNOR ASKED THAT AGENDA ITEM #4 BE MOVED TO POSITION #3

3. **LOOP 101 HOV LANE STUDY UPDATE**

Mr. Porell reported that the design concept report for the Loop 101 HOV project has been completed. ADOT is almost finished with the Categorical Exclusion environmental document.

Mr. Matt Burdick of ADOT's Communication and Community Partnerships office addressed the Commission. Highlights of his presentation included benefits of adding HOV lanes to the Loop 101 including added traffic capacity, new options for expanded bus service in the East Valley, expanded park and ride service, and replacing the cable barrier system with a concrete barrier system. He noted work zones during construction would be isolated to the median area so traffic should not be affected.

Mr. Burdick's presentation included some background on the prior studies regarding HOV lanes. He presented graphic results of a study, which depicted where connection points would occur between freeways. HOV lanes are planned for the entire Loop 101 corridor and the entire Loop 202 corridor. He noted that the Categorical Exclusion environmental document includes a noise evaluation and results of surveys that were conducted. Included in the study is an aerial map depicting the area of expansion. He noted that the Loop 101 project is roughly thirty miles long. Mr. Burdick mentioned that ADOT is currently waiting for the completion of the final environmental document and waiting for the Federal Highway Administration to sign off on the document.

Mr. Burdick reviewed ADOT's plan for implementation, their design efforts, and community outreach efforts. He noted there would be additional community outreach in Scottsdale, where a need for additional sound barriers has been identified. He reiterated that the lanes would be open to all vehicles during the off peak hours and limited to HOV restrictions during peak hours.

In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Davis concerning areas that did not qualify for noise mitigation, Mr. Burdick explained that those areas where noise may exceed the threshold of 64 decibels were identified for mitigation. He reported that because the construction would be restricted to the median area, few areas were identified. Mr. Burdick noted that in the future when additional general purpose lanes are added to the outside of the Loop 101, additional mitigation may be needed.

Fred Garcia, ADOT Environmental Office, confirmed that the current policy on new construction is to enhance the footing of barrier walls in order to accommodate a greater height in the future. However, that policy was implemented after much of the Loop 101 was constructed. He explained that part of the reason areas near Cactus are not receiving mitigation is because the cost per household would exceed what is defined as reasonable cost.

Mr. Burdick clarified that this project came out of Proposition 400, which passed in November 2004. Putting the HOV lanes in place has been a high regional priority.

In response to a question by Commissioner McCall, Mr. Burdick explained that as part of the environmental study, ADOT looked at extending the HOV lanes to Tatum Boulevard and then the study picked up and continued to the San Tan. He explained there would be a freeway-to-freeway ramp in place before the remaining section between Princess Drive and Tatum Boulevard is built. Mr. Burdick noted that ultimately there would be an interconnectivity of HOV lanes between the Loop 101 and State Route 51.

Mr. Garcia clarified for Commissioner McCall that the mitigation near McKellips will be a 16-foot wall that will not be attached to the existing wall. Mr. Burdick explained that aesthetics would be addressed during the design process through an outreach with the adjacent community as well as the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community.

In answer to a question by Commissioner McCall concerning the noise threshold near Cactus, Mr. Garcia explained that an analysis has to prove that mitigation is both reasonable and feasible. Although the noise was beyond the threshold in the Cactus area, it could not be reduced significantly at a reasonable cost.

Commissioner McCall noted she was confused during ADOT's presentation, because it was stated that the noise mitigation study considered the general lanes as well as the HOV lanes. She added that at the end of the presentation, it was stated they would do noise mitigation when they decide to add a general lane.

Mr. Burdick commented that the existing noise levels near Cactus are probably below the 64-decibel threshold because of the rubberized asphalt; however, that is not taken into consideration. He noted that the noise analysis was based on the additional capacity generated by adding the HOV lanes in each direction.

Mr. Porell clarified that two Park-and-Ride locations have been identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and the five year Capital Improvement Program. Currently, a study is being conducted including the vicinity of Shea Boulevard and 90th Street; the other location would be along the 101 Freeway between Pima and Scottsdale Road.

In response to an inquiry by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Burdick suggested that anyone living near a freeway and concerned with noise should contact ADOT. He elaborated that ADOT would come out and take a noise measurement based on the existing conditions. Mr. Burdick noted that when working on the McKellips mitigation, ADOT will work together with City staff in communication with the neighborhood.

Ms. O'Connor mentioned that staff will be working with ADOT on noise mitigation alternatives for the Cactus area, because residents will still be concerned about noise and will expect action as part of the City's due diligence.

4. ADOPTION OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) BUDGET-FY 2006/07

Mr. Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director, reviewed and explained the capital improvement process. Highlights of his presentation included an explanation of the transportation privilege tax collections for fiscal year 2004/05, construction costs and right-of-way costs for projects, significant project changes, major transit projects, continuing programs, a transit improvements summary, a pie chart depicting funding by program area, and a map summarizing what the community can expect for completion. He reiterated that staff was

requesting a recommendation regarding the one and five year improvement plan for fiscal years 2006-2011.

Commissioner Hill inquired about changes from the adopted 2005/2010 CIP, including the rationale for the transfer of the \$2.5 million from Bond 2000 funding for the Thunderbird/Redfield – Scottsdale to Hayden project. He requested an explanation of that transfer.

Mr. Meinhart explained the transfer of \$2.4 million is one-half to one-third of what would be needed in order to widen the remaining section of the corridor from two to four lanes from around 74th Street on the west to around 79th Street on the east. He noted that the current approach is to do major improvements right now to the Hayden/Redfield intersection on the east end of the corridor, which would include improvements from 79th Street to Hayden. This would be done in conjunction with the Hayden/Cactus to Redfield project. On the west end, staff is looking at adding capacity to the intersection at Scottsdale and Thunderbird, realigning 73rd Street further to the east, and adding a signal at the Thunderbird/73rd intersection.

In the short term, there would be one quarter mile of widening on the west end. He mentioned that if it were determined through recommendations from the Transportation Commission and decisions by City Council not to pursue putting a tunnel under the airport, sizable funding from Proposition 400 could be freed to put towards other improvements in the Airpark area, including adding roadway capacity.

In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Davis, Mr. Meinhart clarified that in the existing CIP there are two separate projects on McDonald Drive, Scottsdale Road to Hayden and the Hayden/McDonald intersection. He explained that the Hayden/McDonald intersection is currently under way and will be completed this year. However, McDonald from Scottsdale Road to Hayden has an anticipated delay of approximately four years due to funding. Mr. Meinhart clarified that if costs on a project go up, the project may have to be delayed until another fiscal year through an adjustment to the CIP budget. If an increase is needed for a project during the current fiscal year, it must be approved by City Council through a budget transfer.

In response to a question by Commissioner McCall, Mr. Meinhart clarified on the map entitled Major Roads/Intersections that Thunderbird/Redfield Road runs from Scottsdale Road east to Hayden.

Mr. Meinhart clarified that the spreadsheet shows multiple funding sources for the 96th Street corridor project. He explained the different sources for the funding.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Howard, Mr. Meinhart explained that on the east end of the Cactus Road project, roadway capacity will be increased from two to four lanes based on the approved design. He clarified that the Cactus Road project will have roundabouts at three locations, and a roundabout will be installed on 94th Street north of Union Hills Drive. Mr. Meinhart explained that maintenance is budgeted through the Municipal Services Department and to some degree through the Community Services Department.

Commissioner Howard remarked that he was having trouble understanding where the funding comes from for the projects with multiple funding sources. He would like to have a breakdown of all the funding sources for each project listed. He noted he would be unable to recommend the CIP until he had a full understanding of the sources.

In answer to a question by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Meinhart confirmed that the draft operating budget would restore service levels on the majority of the bus routes that were reduced in 2003,

and improvements are also proposed for the downtown trolley route. He mentioned that a number of improvements are being proposed due to Proposition 400 freeing up some of the local resources.

Chairman Gilliland opined that the projection of calming two to three neighborhoods per year was low. Mr. Meinhart clarified that the budget allows \$500,000 a year for traffic calming and the projects have been costing around \$200,000. If less extensive improvements were recommended, more projects could be undertaken each year.

Mr. Meinhart explained there was a \$1 million reduction in the ITS program over what was listed as the five-year number last year, based on costs of current projects. However, a number of major projects are in the planning stages, so a lot of that money is front-loaded in the five-year plan, along with \$2.3 million in federal grant money. He mentioned that if the tunnel under the Airpark is not recommended to go forward, the Thunderbird/Redfield corridor would likely be expanded to four lanes.

In response to a question by Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Meinhart informed the Commission that City Council Budget Sub-Committee will begin their review in mid-March and noted that a recommendation should be to the Council no later than the end of February. He noted that the formal budget is set in the middle of June, with a tentative budget set in late April so that Council can set the tax rate. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that he could gather the information requested by Commissioner Howard in the appropriate form within a week.

Commissioner Howard noted that there is nothing particular he was opposed to. He just did not understand what the numbers in the chart represented. He asked whether there were some way to withhold his vote until after it is explained to him.

Ms. O'Connor suggested that one possible solution could be the Commission take a vote and Commissioner Howard abstain and identify his desire to follow up with a future opportunity to vote on it; this would help identify whether there would be four votes to move forward. This would allow staff to move some form of a budget recommendation to the Council. The other option would be to move the next Commission meeting to an earlier date in March, which may cause a problem with the availability of a quorum. She noted there is no formal way for Commissioner Howard to have a vote outside of the meeting unless the Commission convened a special meeting specifically for the vote.

Commissioner Hill opined that the CIP budget is the most complex activity that the Commission concerns itself with, and this is also the main task mandated by ordinance for the Commission to perform. He commented that Commissioner Howard's questions about process were appropriate.

COMMISSIONER HILL MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION OF THE CIP BUDGET.

Commissioner Hill opined that it would benefit all of the Commissioners to review the information requested by Commissioner Howard and suggested that could be an item at the proposed retreat. He stated that he would be willing to recommend that the plan be forwarded on to Council.

In response to Vice-Chairman Davis, Ms. O'Connor clarified that Commissioner Howard's concern was about whether there were projects in the upcoming five years that have multiple funding sources and how those sources could be identified. She mentioned that all types of funding are included for clarification. Vice-Chairman Davis agreed that the extra information included in the CIP causes some confusion.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the 74th Street project, the Happy Valley project, and the Hayden Road project are the only projects that have been added this year. The only other modifications to the CIP are to reflect current pricing.

Vice-Chairman Davis suggested an amendment to allow any Commissioner to meet with staff to obtain additional information. Ms. O'Connor noted that any meeting with potential for multiple commissioners would require public notice of possible quorum. Chairman Gilliland suggested that staff could return in March to provide more detail.

COMMISSIONER HILL MOVED TO FORWARD THE CIP BUDGET TO CITY COUNCIL UPON STAFF TAKING THE INITIATIVE TO EDUCATE THE COMMISSION IN MORE DETAIL AS TO THE FUNDING PROCESS OF THE VARIOUS CIP PROJECTS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0). COMMISSIONER HOWARD ABSTAINED.

Commissioner McCall mentioned that when she has had questions in the past she has always been answered in a satisfactory way. She noted that she does not see her input as being about the numbers, but more about her confidence in the process and in the Department. She would recommend the budget be forwarded to City Council. She agreed that it would be beneficial for the Commissioners to be given more education on the subject.

Commissioner Howard reiterated that for reasons of personal principle and integrity, he does not wish to approve something that he does not understand.

Chairman Gilliland asked that staff schedule on the March agenda a review of the information requested by Commissioner Howard.

5. CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT UPDATES

Ms. O'Connor mentioned the Scottsdale Road project open houses scheduled for Wednesday, February 22, and Thursday, February 23. She noted that the meeting on the 23rd would be held at the same time as the Mayor's State of the City address. She mentioned that the East Valley Bus Operations and Maintenance Facility's groundbreaking would be on March 3, 2006 at 3:00 p.m. A free training session on the MAG pedestrian policies and design guidelines is scheduled for Wednesday, March 1, from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m.

Ms. O'Connor provided an update on the Transportation Master Plan, stating that the period of November 2005 to April 2006 is the period in during which background data, goals, objectives, and alternatives, as well as both general and study-focused community input for the plan are developed.

Ms. O'Connor reviewed organizations with which the Transportation staff has held meetings, and noted interdepartmental meetings. She mentioned upcoming focus groups, informational workshops, a City Council Work Study session, and alternatives analysis workshops. Ms. O'Connor clarified that the meetings list should be provided on the City's website and are open to the public. Ms. O'Connor confirmed that the Transportation Master Plan web site is up and running and can be accessed through the City's home page through the Hot Topics link.

Ms. O'Connor reported on the Loop 101 photo enforcement demonstration program. She mentioned that citations would begin on February 22, noting that public feedback has been that traffic is operating more smoothly and safely. Some extremely high speeds have been documented and some drivers have been subject to arrest. She noted there have been approximately 22,000 speeding detections and 7,500 warnings sent out to date

Ms. O'Connor explained that the warning notices on the Loop 101 photo enforcement are mailed to the owner of the vehicle, not the driver. It is possible the people whose names have been listed in the newspaper may not have been speeding.

Chairman Gilliland questioned the difference between enforcement for a photo-enforced ticket as opposed to a ticket given by an officer. Mr. Porell noted the only difference would be under the photo enforcement program, all normal citations would be civil citations, whereas an officer issuing a citation in the field has the ability to issue a criminal citation for speeds in excess of 20 miles above the posted speed limit. Ms. O'Connor added that getting a photo enforcement citation does not preclude a person from getting an officer citation. There is no difference in the follow up between the two types of tickets.

Ms. O'Connor mentioned the bonding company had secured Nesbitt Contracting to replace the defaulted contractor for the 96th Street project. She stated that work is scheduled for completion the end of April 2006. In response to a question by Commissioner McCall concerning accidents on the new roundabouts, Mr. Porell noted there have been no accidents as of yet. However, analysis cannot be done until construction in the area is completed.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner McCall concerning the status of the neighborhood traffic management plan, Ms. O'Connor stated that a revised draft has not yet been issued. It should be prepared by the March meeting. She noted that any Commissioner comments prior to the next meeting would be welcome.

Chairman Gilliland inquired about the status of the project on Pima Road north of the 101. Mr. Meinhart mentioned that a proposal to allow the realignment and completion of the entire infrastructure from Pima Road to the north end of Ironwood Village goes to Council next week. Based on the budget, the final paving would be completed with the second phase of the contract.

Chairman Gilliland suggested adding design-build to one of the agendas for discussion. Mr. Meinhart suggested waiting for more experience with the Pima Road project in order to provide meaningful feedback.

Mr. Porell stated there is a small scale design-build aspect and that the Capital Project Management Department has an on-call contractor to perform minor design services. This company is also working on some of the intersection projects.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

7. **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

Commissioner Howard commented that Paul Basha did a masterful job of collecting information about traffic calming from the web. His traffic calming expertise is a real asset to our consideration of its use in the City and he promised to report back to us at various times during his study. Commissioner Howard stated that some additional thought from the Commission regarding guidelines for this study may be in order. We can actively perform our mission by bringing our expertise and experience to the study before it comes to us in finished form for approval. By that time we will be able only to tinker around the edges of a complete procedure. To carry out our function as a Commission, we should offer opportunities for public expression

on every traffic-calming project and assure that we understand each need for traffic calming in a neighborhood and the prioritization of expenditure of precious City resources.

Commissioner Howard stated that the Commission is not now overworked. Transportation is identified as the dominant public policy issue facing our City, but the Transportation Department has cancelled several of our meetings each year for lack of agenda items. A quick look at the activity of our sister boards and commissions reveals that we are among the least active commissions in Scottsdale. Fifteen boards and commissions are more active. To be true to our mission, we must become more involved in individual transportation projects to ensure that our public does not become alienated.

Commissioner Howard stated that we can help shape the study by establishing well thought out guidelines to ensure that neighborhood integrity survives the traffic calming process. With this in mind, he offered a resolution to the Commission as a discussion starter to establish a framework for the traffic calming study, and asked that this resolution be placed on the agenda for action at the March meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on March 16, 2006.